

REMARKS

After entry of the above amendments, claims 44-53 will be pending in the present application. Previously pending claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 have been cancelled. New claims 44-53 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

In this Amendment, Applicant has cancelled previously pending claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 from further consideration in this application. Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 is not patentable over art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 have been cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims directed to the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 and any other claims in one or more continuing and/or divisional applications.

§ 103 Rejections

Previously pending claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-15, 17-18, 22-23, and 37-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,924,089 to Mocek et al. (hereinafter "Mocek"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,897 to Rubinstein (hereinafter "Rubinstein").

New claim 44 recites "automatically generating a list of all column values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column name and the selected column operator".

In the Office action, the Examiner states:

It is established above that Mocek teaches automatically changing the value boxes according to a selection of an operator.

(October 18, 2007 Office action, pg. 4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, Mocek states:

The condition tab window 370 comprises a database table dropdown listbox 372 controlled by selecting a database table dropdown listbox tab 374, an associated field listbox 376, which displays the fields in the selected database table, a relational condition listbox 378, a search string edit box 380, and a natural language translation listbox 382. The user creates the search portion of an SQL statement (that portion following the WHERE clause) by selecting a table from the database table dropdown listbox 372. This is accomplished by selecting the database table dropdown listbox tab 374. The user also selects an associated database field from those available listed in the associated field listbox 376, and a relational conditional operator from those listed in the relational condition listbox 378. Next, the user enters any desired search string in the search string listbox 380.

(Col. 5, Ins. 1-16 of Mocek) (emphasis added).

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, it is clear from the above passage of Mocek that search strings are not automatically changed according to selection of a relational conditional operator. Rather, a user must enter the desired search string in the "search string listbox 380" of Mocek. Therefore, Mocek does not disclose, teach, or suggest "automatically generating a list of all column values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column name and the selected column operator", as recited in claim 44.

The Examiner also states in the Office action:

However, Mocek fails to teach displaying an automatically generated list of all possible values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query search condition, based on a selected column operator in the second display area. Rubinstein teaches a user interface for search documents that uses an automatically generated list of search terms to implement in to the search query (column 3 lines 57-60). Rubinstein discloses that by automatically generating a list of search terms prompts the user to search for information of interest without requiring the user to conceive search terms.

(October 18, 2007 Office action, pg. 4).

Although Rubinstein does disclose an “automatically generated list of keyword phrases”, the “automatically generated list of keyword phrases” is for all documents stored in a computer-readable medium (see, e.g., col. 3, Ins. 2-17 of Rubinstein). Hence, unlike the “list of . . . column values” in claim 44, the “list of keyword phrases” in Rubinstein is not generated based on the selection of a “column name” and the selection of a “column operator”.

Therefore, the “automatically generated list of keyword phrases” in Rubinstein cannot be construed as disclosing, teaching, or suggesting “automatically generating a list of all column values that are selectable for use in the predicate of the query search condition based on the selected column name and the selected column operator”, as recited in claim 44. Specifically, generating keyword phrases for all documents stored in a computer-readable medium may result in an unmanageable number of keyword phrases. In contrast, generating column values based on column name and column operator selections limits the column values to only those that are relevant for the selected column name and column operator.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 44, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Mocek, in view of Rubinstein.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: January 30, 2008

/Erin C. Ming/
Erin C. Ming
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 47,797
(650) 475-1449